

MEMORANDUM

RE: Meeting minutes taken by Rebecca Kramer
At June 19, 2003 Meeting of the California Ocean Science Trust
Port of Long Beach, Long Beach, California

[Approved at the August 2003 meeting]

Morning Session (10:15 a.m. to noon)

I. Introduction and Welcome

Roll Call- Rebecca Kramer, Secretary

Members of the Board-

Present- Mary Nichols (Interim Chair), Burr Heneman, Beth Jines, Charles

Kennel, Geraldine Knatz, Russ Moll, Mark Gold (arrived late)

Not Present- James Kelly, Fred Keeley, Fred Klass.

Staff- Present- Melissa Miller-Henson, Brian Baird, Rebecca Kramer

Additional Attendees- Suzanne Lawrence, John Ugoretz, Mark Carr, Mary Bergen.

Mary Nichols.

Thanks to the Members and attendees for their continued enthusiasm and support for the project. Special thanks to Geraldine Knatz for providing the facilities. Good start and the next step will be to move forward. Review of highlights from January meeting- name change, committee(s) formation, mission and focus within the law.

II. Review and Approve Minutes from January 19, 2003.

Motion- Review and Adopt minutes from January meeting

Made by Mary Nichols, seconded by Burr Heneman, carried by unanimous vote of the Board.

III. Operational Policies and Procedures

The draft circulated at January meeting was taken to the State of CA Attorney General (AG). The AG determined the California Ocean Science Trust (Cal OST) must be a separate 501(c)3 non-profit corporation. M. Nichols requested that the paperwork be initiated to begin that process, by Melissa Miller-Henson, even though that request may have been inappropriate. The initial paperwork will most likely be filed with CA and the IRS within a week. A decision can be expected from CA probably within two months, and from the IRS hopefully within 6 months.

In the interim, the Cal OST may begin to work because working and laying groundwork under the auspices of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation's (NFWF) 501(c)3 umbrella.

Issue of Board Insurance and Indemnification was discussed. The indemnification issue resolved and the insurance needs to be purchased before any grant awards are made, but the groundwork and the Research Priority Workshop may continue.

The most recent version of the Operational Policies and Procedures will be circulated, reviewed, and adopted by phone or at the August meeting.

IV. Grant Making Procedures

Discussed any suggestions or questions on the June 11, 2003 version of the Draft Policies and Procedures for Grant Making, written by the subcommittee. It is important to shape the RFP/RFB to correspond to the goals of the Cal OST For RFP/RFB development there should be a review process- reviewed by both federal and academic representatives, and then approved by the Board before issuance, even after strategic plan is in place. Should hold off developing RFP/RFB's until the Strategic Plan for the Cal OST is developed and adopted.

It is very important to keep in mind that the Cal OST has limited resources, and needs to put those resources where they are most needed and can be most efficacious.

One salient point is the staffing shortage. Even though even one agrees that the current collaborative, adaptive management model is the most useful and effective, the critical mass to implement this strategy has not been achieved. Perhaps this is an opportunity to revisit the Regional Ocean councils.

Also, the Board may be able to come up with a strategic plan for spending the resources, but need to connect the policy people to the science people to get anything useful accomplished. Need government and academic/ research institutions working together in a sustainable partnership. One of the goals for the Cal OST should be to broker partnerships between the involved groups and perhaps there should be a dedicated staff member to pursue that.

There are ways to increase the potential of the current Cal OST resources- a matching grant program for leverage, dedicate some of the current funds to "fund raising" activities. The original CIAP funds had some "set aside" for staffing (~\$100,000)

This led into a discussion of the staffing for the Cal OST issue. The State employees don't have time to pursue this in addition to their work. Perhaps the Cal OST should hire someone- an intern, a retiree, a part time person- to be dedicated staff. Where would that person be housed, cyclic nature of work, outsource some of the policy, financial, and administrative work. Once the 501(c)3 is established, Mary will remove herself as Chair, and be the government liaison/ contact.

Back to discussion of Grant Making Procedures draft. Default operating plan for expending discretionary funds should be development of a peer reviewed, Board approved RFP/RFB. The proposal should be a two tiered process- an open call for per-proposals, and then invitations for full proposal submittal. This process should be flexible and tailored to the current needs for funding that round.

This process should not begin until AFTER the August Research Priorities workshop so that a strategic focus is in place to guide the wise expenditure of the limited funds.

Adopting this Default Process right now, does NOT mean it is being set into motion.

Summary- default procedures to develop a framework for expenditure of discretionary funds using RFP/RFB's developed with advisors and approved by the full Board. Each

RFP/RFB will be specific to the current needs for funding and have an evaluation component.

Motion: Adopt Interim Guidelines for Grant Making Procedures.

Made by Burr Heneman, seconded by Charles Kennel, carried by unanimous vote of Board.

IV. Research Priorities Workshop

Review of draft Structure of Workshop document. Open floor for discussion, suggestions, and directions, questions, etc.

Structure for Workshop-

2 days- 1st day- 4 Working Group Panels with panelists presenting answers to the previously distributed questions.

2nd Day- AM- Board discussion of Day 1 results, and then development of Strategic Plan for Investing Funds.

PM- 3rd Meeting of the Board of Trustees

Discussion moved to development of what are the key questions that the Board needs to ask in order to get useful answers; what groups should be represented on the Panels, and who specifically should be invited to be Panel members.

Panel Member- 1 Resource Agency representative, 1 Academic representative, and at least 1 Expert. The expert can be from an NGO, from the private sector, from an advocacy group, etc. These should be people who are willing to cross over the traditional institutional borders, can “think outside the box” Additional people may be in the audience, but not members of the panel.

Panel Topics. The ones in the handout which were derived from the CIAP proposal are acceptable. Perhaps the discussion of Indicators of Ecosystem Health? Are there long term issues which don’t fit into discrete categories or panel topics, or should the timeliness of an issue be one of the questions?

Questions. Need to develop specific questions to give to the panelists ahead of time.

Suggestions such as, “what is needed to work together between the regulatory agencies and the scientific community;” “what would make a difference;” or should it be: “where do you think the knowledge gaps are and how do you go about filling those gaps;” “where do we build the bridge between policy knowledge and scientific knowledge?”

Ultimately, the Board needs to develop and approve the questions.

The questions will be distributed to panelists before the meeting. The panelists will be requested to 1) develop individual answers to the questions and 2) work together as a panel to present potential recommendations for solutions and implementation.

Panel Members- need list of suggestions from Board by middle of next week to get final list together. Final Panelist list approved by Board, either through email or on the phone. Need to hire an outside consultant to undertake putting this Workshop together. This consultant would be responsible for working with Panelists before hand on answers and recommendations, assimilating the results of the Panels, presenting that to the Board at the AM session on Day 2, developing and working the results of the workshop into a

Strategic Plan for the Board to review, edit, and approve, etc. Budget for facilitator not to exceed \$5,000. Possible Consultants discussed Brock Bernstein, and others.
Email reminder to Board about getting their potential panelists and questions to Staff by middle of next week.

V. Future Staffing for the Cal OST

NFWF's role if it is a independent 501(c)3; may need to re-negotiate.
Established Committee for Staffing- comprised of G. Knatz, B Heneman, M Gold, and C Kennel. To develop recommendations and alternatives for activities, policy, fiscal, management, etc. and who will accomplish these activities. Will develop a) interim recommendations, for next 6 months, and b) long term recommendations for future. Possibly even a list of potential candidates. Recommendations ready for discussion at the August meeting.

Future Existence of Cal OST- larger entity, what type of staff- associate director, someone who can do day to day management and policy.

NFWF can remain in current capacity until the Board decides on what to do, most likely for the next couple of months, until the August meeting. Very clear the NFWF cannot engage in advocacy or policy work. The independent 501(c)3 factor may be an issue.

BREAK FOR LUNCH- around 12:15.

To reconvene at about 12:45.

Afternoon Session (12:45 to 2:15)

VI. Guest Speaker Presentations

Case Study- the Cooperative Research and Assessment of Nearshore Ecosystems (CRANE) Partnership Model

John Ugoretz, Mary Bergen- CA Department of Fish and Game

Mark Carr- University of CA- Santa Cruz (UCSC); Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO)

Mary Bergen- focus on Monitoring Nearshore Rocky Reefs habitats. State wide data collection inside and outside of reserves and MPA system.

Fifteen active members of CRANE ranging from universities, NGOs, agencies and private groups working together and building from existing resources. Mostly use diver surveys to collect data for fish population density, size and ecosystem components. CRANE helps give a statewide picture, plus assists in identifying data gaps.

John Ugoretz. Focus on Channel Islands Marine Protected Area (CIMPA) Because CIMPA is new, excellent opportunity for baseline measurements for measuring effectiveness of MPA's because they already have data from before the MPA was established. Early data on population monitoring, stock assessments, impact of

commercial fisheries of resources inside and the effect of MPAs as a reserve system can be measured from the beginning. Primarily using diver surveys to gather data at prioritized sites within and outside of the CIMPA.

Mark Carr- UCSC, PISCO. Three objective to long term ecological research- 1) better understanding of coastal ecosystems and ecology, 2) train undergraduate and graduate students in novel interdisciplinary approaches to basic and applied ecology; 3) expedite process that gets information to the policy makers. This is a fully collaborative with management agencies. Diver surveys are the primary method of data collection and these surveys help detect the change across geographic and biological regimes and across spatial and temporal variants. This raw data directly translates into information related to structural realities of ecosystems which can be used in key management and policy decisions.

Predictive models can be extrapolated from CRANE and PISCO at an ecosystem level and used for knowledgeable evaluation of current policies and management practices. There are inherent gaps in the data, operator error, and variations in natural fish behaviors that will effect truth of conclusions; however, long term data can help smooth the anomalies over time. Standardization and calibration of the suites of different data-gathering methods will also decrease the inherent margin of error.

The basic infrastructure is already in place so it isn't as expensive as it would have been to start from scratch, but there is a continued need for maintenance, upgrading, and expansion.

The CIMPA presents an excellent opportunity Pilot Study to begin at the "ground floor" and ensure reliable defensible data on whether MPA are a useful tool, what size they should be, how the network should be spaced, etc.

An important factor which could turn into a good marketing strategy is that if MPAs are proven an effective tool for management; they could allow for a much simpler regulatory regime. Ecosystem based regulatory actions may be simpler and easier to enforce and manage than species specific regulations and policies. Continuing monitoring and gathering data in the meantime.

This is a good place to start the experiment but there will always be 2 different parts that need to be recognized- 1) the regulatory arena, and 2) the scientific research arena.

Adjourn at 2:15 pm.